IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

MONDAY, THE TWENTY FOURTH DAY OF JANUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE N.V. RAMANA

WRIT PETITION NO : 454 of 2005

Between:

Puramsetti Bapu S/o.Ramaiah
Chintagunda Gra Panchayat, Jannaram Mandal,
Laxettipet Tq, Adilabad Dist.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 Govt of A.P.Panchayt Raj Department rep by its Secretary,
Panchayat Raj Departmetn, Secretariat Buildings, Saifabad,
Hyderabad.
2 The Collector (Panchayat Wing) Adilabad.
3 The District Panchayat Officer, Adilabad.
4 The Divisional Panchayat Officer, Nirmal,Adilabad.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue an appropriate writ, order or direction, particularly one in the nature of Mandamus, declaring the action of the 1st respondent herein in not suspending the proceedings No. 690/K4. pts/2004 dt 18-11-2004 of the 2nd respondent herein pending disposal of the Revision petition filed by the petitioner before him against the said order of the 2nd respondent herein as illegal, arbitrary, unreasonable, contrary to the provisions of Sec.249 of A.P.Panchayat Raj Act 1994 and also violative of Articles 14,21 of the constitution of India and issue a consequential direction to the 1st respondent herein to suspend the operation of the said proceedings dt 18-11-2004 of the 2nd respondent herein and pass such other order or orders.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.M.RAJAMALLA REDDY

Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR REVENUE.

The Court at the stage of admission made the following:

ORDER:

The petitioner claims to be elected surpanch of Chintaguda Gram Panchayat. The petitioner was suspended by order dated 18-11-2004 under section 249 (6) of the A.P.Panchayat Raj Act (for short the Act). Questioning the said proceedings, the petitioner filed W.P.22050 of 2004 and the same was dismissed by order dated 1-12-2004 permitting the petitioner to file a revision under section 264 of the Act. It is stated that the petitioner has filed a revision before the first respondent on

21-12-2004 together with an application for interim order. The grievance of the petitioner is that even though he has filed revision along with application seeking suspension of the order dated

18-11-2004, the first respondent has not passed any order in the interlocutory application, pending disposal of the revision, protecting his interest. Hence, the present writ petition.

Heard the learned counsel for petitioner and learned Government Pleader for Revenue. Both counsel agreed for disposal of the writ petition at the admission stage.

Since the revision filed by the petitioner against the order dated 18-11-2004 is pending consideration, I deem it appropriate to dispose of the writ petition directing the first respondent to pass appropriate orders in the revision expeditiously. Till such time, status quo existing as on today shall be maintained.

Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

_____ N.V.RAMANA,J

24TH JAN,2005

TVK

To:

1. The Secretary, Pachayat Raj Department,

Government of Andhra Pradesh,

Secretariat Buildings, Saifabad, Hyderabad

2. The Collector (Panchayat wing) Adilabad

3. The District Panchayat Oficer,Adilabad

4. The Divisional Panchayat Officer, Nirmal,

Adilabad District

5. Two CCs to the Government Pleader for

Revenue,High Court Buildings, Hyderabad (OUT)

6. Two CD copies